DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 511 **IR 008 105**

AUTHOR Allison, Anne Marie
TITLE Factors Affecting Administration in United States Academic Libraries during the Period 1971- 75. Occasional Paper No. 138.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Graduate School of Library Science.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 34p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, 249 Armory Building, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL 61820

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Administrative Change; Administrative Policy; Decision Making; *Library Administration; *Library Surveys; Organization; Tenure; Trend Analysis; Unions

ABSTRACT

Items studied in a library survey of U.S. institutions of higher education included shifts in decision-making bodies, unionization, and tenure. From the 1032 questionnaires returned, these findings resulted: (1) 175 of 1025 have unionized library staff--135 of them since 1971; (2) 496 of 1018 librarians responding said they were organized as a faculty or in a similar structure; 22 of 37 academic research libraries answering this question on structure responded similarly; for all libraries claiming faculty or faculty-like structure, 30 percent said that this organization represented a change since 1971; (3) in many areas of the study, 4-year colleges offering no graduate degrees reported the least amount of change; in many categories, the largest institutions (with 10,000 or more full-time enrolled students) reported the highest degree of change. Findings are summarized in 18 tables and discussed; the questionnaire and coding sheets are included. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184511

DATE May 1979 NO. 138

University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science

US ISSN 0073-5310

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACTORS AFFECTING ADMINISTRATION IN UNITED STATES ACADEMIC LIBRARIES DURING THE PERIOD 1971-75

by

ANNE MARIE ALLISON

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Mason

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 1
INTRODUCTION 2
BACKGROUND 3
QUESTIONNAIRE 6
PROCEDURE 7
RESULTS 7
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 22
REFERENCES 26
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE 27
APPENDIX II: CODING SHEET 30
VITA 31

IR008105

ABSTRACT

A committee of ALA's Library Administration Division set out to consider a perceived decline in authority of library directors. Deliberations on this topic led to discussion of a belief that change was taking place in library administration. This concern prompted development of a questionnaire on the size, speed and directions of such change. Items studied included shifts in decision-making bodies, unionization and tenure. U.S. institutions of higher education were sent 3000 questionnaires. Within 2 months, 1032 were returned.

Among the 1025 librarians answering the question, "Is your library staff unionized?" 175 said yes. However, of these, 135 stated that this unionization had taken place since 1971. Asked whether or not librarians were organized as a faculty or in a similar structure, 496 or 49% of the 1018 librarians responding answered yes. Thirty-seven ARL libraries answered this question with 22 or 60% saying yes. Among all libraries claiming faculty or faculty-like structure, 30% said this organization represented a change since 1971. In many of the areas covered in the study, 4-year colleges which offered no graduate degrees seemed the most conservative, reporting the least amount of change. In many categories, the largest institutions (those with FTE enrollment of 10,000 or more) reported the highest degree of change.

Narratives attached to many returns indicated shifts not so much in structural patterns as in personal response to, and behavior within, the structure. Sometimes stunning, sometimes poignant, these comments defy tabulation but provide a human perspective.

Implications for further research are challenging. These data will perhaps be most significant when paired, in 1980, with similar totals in a proposed longitudinal study.

> "Needless to say, I depend on the strictest confidence mentioned in your letter. For if anyone here saw this, I would be fired."[1]

INTRODUCTION

Glenn Doman of the Institutes for the Achievement of Human Potential at Philadelphia, remarked:

> Beginning a project in clinical research is like getting on a train with an unknown destination. It's full of mystery and excitement but you never know whether you'll have a compartment or be going third class, whether the train has a diner or not, whether the trip will cost a dollar or all you've got and, most of all, whether you are going to end up where you intended or in a foreign place you never dreamed of visiting.[2]

A questionnaire project developed by a committee, administered by mail, and tabulated by a team is certainly not "clinical research." Yet, a parallel exists. A committee of working librarians believed that they saw a dilution of authority in their profession. They felt that administrators were being pressured on one side by growing strengths of staffs seeking self-determination and, on the other side, by institutional hierarchies facing budget cuts and general public disenchantment with libraries and education.

The committee's work led to research activity whose final result is the information reported here. The "clinical research" produced a relatively accurate description of symptoms, and some cause/effect diagnosis. Prescriptions will have to be written at a later date.

The committee's journey took them to several interesting destinations. The project was a success in that it gathered an array of data to provide a basis for further investigation. The archive of completed questionnaires is in itself a learning resource and is being held for further investigation. Comments offered by many of those who completed the forms, while not statistically conclusive, provide insight into the real world of academic library administration.

Some of these comments contradict others. For instance, an Association of Research Libraries (ARL) librarian, discussing "change" manifest in librarians' faculty committees, says the work of these committees "indicate movement toward broader staff input into policy recommendations for the libraries." Another says the committee structure "has become more advisory and less decision-oriented." Some excerpts from these narratives are included in this report. It seems that "peer evaluation" and "participatory management" may be new lamps which shine no more brightly than the old.

BACKGROUND

The Library Administration Division of the American Library Association (ALA) "provides an organizational framework for encouraging the study of administrative theory, for improving the practice of administration in libraries, and for indentifying and fostering administrative skill."[3] Within this division, the Library Organization and Management Section (LOMS) "exercises responsibility for matters pertaining to the furtherance of efficient library operation in all types of libraries."[4] The Committee on Comparative Library Organization is a working committee within LOMS. The task of this committee is "to collect information regarding library organizations,...trends, developments, and theories; and to conduct and/or recommend research related to this concern."[5]

In 1974, this committee undertook general exploration and review of the role of the library director. The problem of administration is surely not limited to chief librarians. The department head in a typical large library, who is responsible for several professionals, 10-15 support staff and a fluctuating group of part-time assistants, may well be more involved in management than in the art and science of librarianship for which he or she was prepared in a library science graduate program. However, to provide a focus, the committee elected to center its study on library directors.

Traditionally, the chief librarian in colleges and universities was responsible to the chief academic officer. This librarian usually dealt directly with both staff and an ultimate superior. However, since the early 1960s, groups reporting to the chief librarian and groups to whom he was responsible, seemed to be growing in number and diversity. In many cases, it appeared that policy-recommending committees were evolving into policy-making committees. Unionization of clerical, technical, paraprofessional and professional staffs, faculty status, and tenure for professional librarians were seen as factors directly influencing the chief librarian's traditional role.

An article in College and Research Libraries reported that: "in one year, 1971-72, ... seven of the directors of the Big Ten university libraries (plus the University of Chicago) left their posts, only one a normal retirement for age.

These are major universities on the national scene whose directorships had been stable in the past."[6] A number of well-known directors, leaders in the profession and scholars in the field, have since resigned in response to what many felt to be "palace revolutions." It was posited that, in several instances, library directors were faced with an impossible task, being caught between several strident constituencies.

This opinion was reinforced by the frustration mirrored in some replies to the questionnaire. On the subject of promotion and tenure, one individual wrote:

> At this college, an outside faculty committee of chairmen of academic departments first screens such recommendations by rating those recommended by secret ballot. In practice, this system results in promotions at times approved on the basis of traditional academic accomplishments (research, publications, etc.) rather than performance as librarians....The Library Director's job turns out to be one of having to make a campaign speech for those on his staff whom he feels deserve promotion....He could also function merely as his committee's messenger-boy.

Another echoed this feeling with the statement: "Our arrangement obviously deprives the Library Director of authority to make personnel decisions....It also weakens the position of supervisors and middle managers, creating in them a feeling of indifference, unhappiness or helplessness when their recommendations are disregarded."

A recent study by a respected consultant firm, conducted for the Columbia University Libraries, recommended that in order to achieve optimum service to the institution, the chief library officer should "have the title of Vice President" of the university.[7] Nevertheless, the committee felt they saw increasing layers of intermediaries between presidents and chancellors and chief academic librarians. In the public library area, it appeared that bureaucratic intermediaries were building walls between directors of public libraries and their ultimate fiscal and political superiors. A committee member noted that directors of some public libraries were reporting to municipal recreation authorities, along with playground management.

Finding out whether these apparent trends were facts or impressions seemed to be an appropriate official concern for the Committee on Comparative Library Organization. A questionnaire was developed under the leadership of Dallas Shawkey, Cataloging Coordinator of the Brooklyn Public Library, who was chairman of the committee until 1975. Most of the foundation work on the questionnaire was coordinated by Betty Jo Mitchell, Associate Director, California State University, Northridge.

After some investigation, the committee decided that while their situations are similar in many ways, differences between public and academic libraries were sufficient to justify separate studies and distinctive questionnaires. They consequently began their research with academic libraries during the years 1971-75, and planned to develop an on-going project with quinquennial updates. Pilot questionnaires were sent to 50 libraries. In Feb. 1976, the committee met in Chicago to examine these preliminary responses. The questionnaires, in final form, were mailed in July 1976. Leo Cabell, Acting Director of Libraries

at the University of Colorado (Boulder), chairman of the committee at that time, assumed responsibility for the distribution. Questionnaires were sent to all institutions on a Higher Education Institutions mailing list supplied to Cabell by Frank Schick of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

By the end of Aug. 1976, 3000 questionnaires were mailed and 1032 were returned. By Nov. 1976, the overall response was 40%. (Questionnaires returned after Sept. 1 are not included in this review.)

The returns were divided into four general categories:

1. 2-year institutions,
2. 4-year institutions without graduate programs,
3. 4-year institutions with graduate programs but whose libraries were not members of ARL, and
4. 4-year institutions with graduate programs whose libraries were members of ARL.

Members of ARL, the Association of Research Libraries, were considered a distinct subgroup because their patron communities, and the size, maturity and nature of their collections, generate unique demands. Both staff and leadership were thought to be subject to internal and external constraints different from those in most other libraries. This assumption seemed to be verified in that some responses of the ARL group were distinctly different from those of the majority of libraries reporting. ARL's ARL Statistics 1975-1976, sent to members on Jan. 31, 1977, cited 94 university members of the association.[8] Of these, 37 replied to the questionnaire.

Linda Beaupre, University of California (Berkeley); Lee Putnam, Gallaudet College and Anne Marie Allison, Kent State University, each agreed to be responsible for one of the first three categories. Keith Cottam, University of Tennessee (Knoxville), undertook to study replies of the ARL members. Beaupre, Putnam and Allison analyzed groupings assigned to them using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer programs available in their own institutions. Cottam, working with 37 ARL replies, did his computations manually. Replies were analyzed with three objectives: (1) to tabulate and interpret data, and to make inferences; (2) to provide a learning situation in which to develop approaches to examine all completed questionnaires in the study; and (3) to assist in questionnaire refinement.

The 4 investigators reported at the 1977 ALA midwinter meeting in Washington, DC, and were surprised at the similarities between their totals. Many of these are reproduced in tabular form in this report. When asked about change in the hierarchy to which the library must report, 25% of the institutions without graduate programs said yes. Among 4-year institutions with graduate programs but without ARL membership, 23% answered. yes. Of the ARL members, 25% said yes.

In reply to a question on changes in internal library committees making policy recommendations during the period 1971-75, those who responded affirmatively accounted for 44% of the institutions without graduate programs, 49% of the 4-year institutions with graduate programs but without ARL membership, and 40% of the ARL members. This similarity was repeated in a number of categories.

The group of 4 analysts agreed that Allison would incorporate the total findings into a final report for publication and dissemination to the academic and library communities. The population discussed in this final report is the 1032 responding libraries. Their replies were analyzed with several objectives:

1. to tabulate and interpret data, and to make inferences;
2. to test the hypothesis that some change indicated by the accumulated responses would be significant;
3. to assist in planning future research, in particular the committee's projected study of the same universe of libraries for the years 1976-80; and
4. to read and interpret narrative attachments which accompanied many of the questionnaires.

QUESTIONNAIRE

A copy of the questionnaire is appended to this report. In it, 18 general questions offer opportunities for approximately 40 responses or comments. One item requests an organization chart. The subjective nature of responses to questions such as, "What changes have occurred in the past years in the kinds of decisions being made?" and "What kinds of decision are made by each person or group?" do not lend themselves to statistical interpretation. These probably cannot readily be analyzed or interpreted by available machine methods. However, 16 discrete responses seemed to be viable candidates for encoding, listing and interpretation.

A coding sheet was devised to analyze these 16 responses. Two items, not part of the original questionnaires, were added. These were a sequential number, arbitrarily assigned to each complete questionnaire, and the date the questionnaire was received by Cabell. A copy of the coding sheet devised is also appended to this report. It includes, for each reporting institution, the following data:

1. sequential number,
2. date of receipt by Cabell,
3. name of institution,
4. institution type,
5. institution age,
6. FTE enrollment for fall 1975,
7. change in reporting line above chief librarian in past 5 years,
8. change in supervisory bodies above chief librarian in past 5 years,
9. change in policy-recommending library committees in past 5 years,
10. change in policy-making library committees in past 5 years,
11. organization of librarians in a faculty or faculty-like body,
12. occurrence of change in this organization in the 5 years studied,
13. exclusion of any librarians from this organization,
14. portion of decisions directly affecting library policy made by individuals or groups outside the library for summer 1976,
15. portion of decisions directly affecting library policy made by individuals or groups outside the library for summer 1971,
16. unionization of librarians
17. occurrence of unionization in the past 5 years, and
18. tenure for librarians.

PROCEDURE

Sequential numbers were assigned to each questionnaire and the same number was repeated at the top of its companion coding sheet. The questionnaire was examined and appropriate information was transferred to the coding sheet. Coded information was keypunched and processed.

Full printouts are available, as an archive, with the original questionnaire, but are not reproduced in this report. Interpretations of the results and some tabular representations follow.

RESULTS

The fact that 1032 libraries participated in the study, returning questionnaires within 2 months, is impressive. Many included elaborate organization charts and several pages of subjective commentaries. This effort on the part of respondents may merit scrutiny and interpretation beyond that given here. Spontaneous outpourings of personal opinion indicate that the project, if nothing else, provided library administrators a forum for expressing their feelings, not unlike that provided to the general public by Dear Abby. Many of these comments are repeated here. For ease of reporting, the institutions have been classified in the following groups:

Group A	libraries in 2-year institutions
Group B	libraries in 4-year institutions not offering graduate programs
Group C	libraries in institutions offering 4-year programs and also granting graduate degrees, although the libraries were not ARL members in summer 1976
Group D	libraries in institutions holding ARL membership in summer 1976.

The basis for this report is 1032 usable, returned questionnaires. Responses such as "yes" and "no" are tallied. Totals are also given, in most instances, for "no response." Nevertheless, on individual tables the total of "yes," "no," and "no response" answers does <u>not</u> always equal 1032. The reason for this is that a few replies were considered impossible to classify, e.g., some responses were, "Yes and no"; others, "Yes, but...." This was the result of flaws in the instrument, problems of semantics, and the nature of any survey done without personal interviews.

Age of Institution

Table 1 illustrates the array of institution ages reported in 1027 responses. In Group A, the 383 2-year institutions reporting age showed an anticipated equal distribution. About one-third were 25 years old or older; about one-third were 10-25 years old; and about one-third listed themselves as being 5-10 years old. For groups B, C and D, 87% of the total institutions reporting were at least 25 years old.

TABLE 1. AGE OF INSTITUTION REPORTED IN SUMMER 1976

AGE IN YEARS	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
25+	127	33	213	83	313	89	36	97	689	67
10-25	122	32	30	12	22	6	1	3	175	17
5-10	115	30	12	5	10	3			137	13
5	19	5	2	1	5	1			26	3
Totals	383	100	257	100	350	100	37	100	1027	100

Full-Time Equivalency (FTE)

Based on the U.S. Office of Education definition, FTE enrollment was reported by 971 institutions. Results produced a profile of student population figures for fall 1975.

TABLE 2. FALL 1975 FTE ENROLLMENT

MEASURE	GROUP A	GROUP B	GROUP C	GROUP D
Mean	2984	1296	4494	22,637
Median	1628	913	2799	31,260
Mode	1200	1100	5000	21,000
Minimum	40	45	70	5,700
Maximum	17,000	19,643	24,118	68,223
Range	16,960	19,598	24,048	62,523
No. of institutions reporting	361	248	329	33

A special analysis was made of group C, libraries in 4-year institutions which offered graduate programs but were not members of ARL. These libraries ranged from a low FTE of 70 (reported by a seminary), to a high of 24,118 (San Diego State University). In group C, 23 institutions did not indicate FTE. The 329 schools in this category which did report FTE fell into the following quartile pattern:

1/4	70--1150 FTE
1/4	1151--2800 FTE
1/4	2801--6203 FTE
1/4	6204--24,118 FTE

The median was 2799. A division of the institutions into deciles revealed the following pattern:

1.	1/10	70--450	6.	1/10	2801--4132
2.	1/10	451--1032	7.	1/10	4133--5041
3.	1/10	1033--1479	8.	1/10	5042--7218
4.	1/10	1480--2041	9.	1/10	7219--11,100
5.	1/10	2042--2800	10.	1/10	11,101--24,048

It seemed that perhaps those in the last two, or surely in the last decile, might form a more homogeneous unit if studied with the ARL institutions. This belief was borne out in the case of some variables studied (see Libraries in Institutions with FTE of 10,000 or More, p.22). Data on these libraries is compared with other 4-year institutions studied in Table 3. For purposes of discussion, these libraries serving larger student bodies have been labelled group X libraries.

TABLE 3. FALL 1975 FTE ENROLLMENT FOR 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

MEASURE	GROUP C	GROUP X	GROUP D	GROUPS X AND D
Mean	4494	14,648	22,637	37,285
Median	2799	14,334	31,260	45,594
Measure	5000	11,500	21,000	32,500
Mode	70	10,000	5,700	15,700
Maximum	24,118	24,118	68,223	92,341
Range	24,048	14,118	62,523	76,641
No. of institutions reporting	329	39	33	72

Change in Reporting Hierarchy Above the Library During the Period 1971-75

This question (item 6 on the questionnaire) asked if the respondents perceived change in the reporting path from the library director to the institution's chief administrative officer during the 5 years studied. Replies are illustrated in Table 4. A great deal of change was anticipated. However, about 24% of the 1028 libraries answering this question said, yes. Some on the committee considered that response predictable, given the dynamics in higher education during the years studied.

TABLE 4. CHANGE IN REPORTING HIERARCHY ABOVE LIBRARY, 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	115	30	43	17	78	22	11	28	9	24	245	24
No	248	64	204	79	265	76	26	67	28	76	745	72
No Response	23	6	10	4	5	1	2	5			38	4
Totals	386	100	257	100	348	100	39	100	37	100	1028	100

It would be interesting and worthwhile to study responses of other academic and service areas in the same universities to the same basic questions to learn if respondents in these areas see themselves as moving closer to or further from administration.

Beaupre and Putnam analyzed returns of the 2-year institutions and the 4-year institutions without graduate programs and identified the following types of change: 29 of 643 colleges, or 5%, called the new reporting "more direct"; 89 institutions, or 14%, called the new reporting "less direct"; 20, or 3%, noted they had experienced a lateral shift; 502 of the 643 gave no response to the question, "How did this reporting change?"; and 3 gave responses which fell into an "other" class.

The following comment is pertinent:

> On the premise that the Library is basically a service to the faculty, it should be grouped for administrative purposes in a cluster called Central Faculty Services. In this same nest would be placed Research and Program Development, the somewhat mythical Instructional Development and Media Resources unit, a portion of the computer operation, and doubtless other chicks. The committee recommends that Central Faculty Services be organized and managed as an interrelated and interdepartmental system of services to faculty. This group of services would be the responsibility of a System Manager providing a focus for Deans and faculty for the improvement of faculty services. In short, the proposal lines up like this: (1) the Director of Libraries should, to use the language of the report, provide a focus for a System Manager (a fine academic title!); (2) the System Manager would provide a focus for a Dean of Academic Services; (3) the Dean of Academic Services would provide a focus for the Provost; and (4) while that focus is pretty certain to get badly blurred with so many hands adjusting the knobs, theoretically something might get through to the President.
>
> It is believed that things don't work very well that way, as our sister institutions recognize by making the Director of Libraries a Dean in title or by recognizing the rank by inclusion in the Council of Deans. Columbia recently went one step further by making the Director a full Vice-President. This isn't a matter of pride of position. It is very much a matter of the role of the library in academic process. Clearly, either we or they are headed the wrong way.

Change Within the Supervisory Office Above the Library During the Period 1971-75

Detailed figures for this item (number 8 of the questionnaire) appear in Table 5. This asked if the higher body or office, to which the library reports, had itself changed during the past 5 years, excluding personnel shifts. Of 1032 libraries answering this question, only 57, or about 6% cited such a change. A change in this office or body was not noted in 82% of the responses.

TABLE 5. CHANGE IN SUPERVISORY OFFICE ABOVE LIBRARY, 1971-75.

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	12	3	14	5	29	8	1	3	2	5	57	6
No	257	67	236	92	319	91	38	97	35	95	847	82
No Response	117	30	7	3	4	1					128	12
Totals	386	100	257	100	352	100	39	100	37	100	1032	100

A change in the reporting line above the library was noted by 24% of the responding libraries; only 6% noted a change in the office or body at the end of this reporting line. This may be significant. However, without equal knowledge of other organizations, public and private, one cannot analyze this apparent imbalance of tendencies.

One comment on development in bodies above libraries was:

> As the University Administration has attempted to comply with the proliferation of federal laws and policies relating to wages, hours, racial, sexual and minority discrimination, there has been an augmentation of rules and regulations governing these matters which has significantly affected Library Administration. A good bit of our former flexibility and freedom of action has disappeared. While one may support the aims of these new regulations; one cannot ignore the fact that administrative actions in many areas are now much more difficult, and in many cases over the short run, destructive of standards of efficiency.

Employment of Consultants

This question (item 8 c. on the questionnaire), asked whether consultants were employed by the office or body to which the library's chief administrative office or body is responsible. Replies are tabulated in Table 6.

TABLE 6. EMPLOYMENT OF CONSULTANTS BY SUPERVISORY OFFICE ABOVE LIBRARY, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	159	41	118	46	152	45	18	46	2	5	431	42
No	91	24	70	27	86	25	7	18			247	24
No Response	136	35	69	27	102	30	14	36	35	95	342	34
Totals	386	100	251	100	340	100	39	100	37	100	1020	100

Some "yes" replies included comments such as, "Yes, but they are not concerned with library matters." This question was answered by 1020 libraries. Only 2 of the 37 ARL institutions gave an affirmative answer.

The results of using such consultants were revealed in some commentaries. One librarian said:

> Somewhat over five years ago,...Associates (a management consultant firm) surveyed all New Jersey state operations including the state colleges. With the implementation of their report, the full-faculty status formerly enjoyed by our librarians was removed. Since that time the state college librarians have instituted certain lawsuits in an attempt to regain that which had been lost. The same librarians were most instrumental in the successful attempt of the American Federation of Teachers to become the bargaining agent for the state college faculty and librarians. This is not to say their ability to carry out their professional responsibilities has been impaired. However, these activities have interfered, often considerably, with time available for the carrying out of their responsibilities. However, with the attainment of an agreement this year between the state authorities and the bargaining agent, the necessity for time-consuming meetings, conversations and telephone calls are apparently past, at least until it is time again to negotiate a new contract.

Change in Internal Library Reporting During the Period 1971-75

This question (item 10 on the questionnaire) asked if there had been changes in reporting lines on the library's organization chart during the period 1971-75. Replies are illustrated in Table 7.

TABLE 7. CHANGE IN REPORTING LINES OF LIBRARY ORGANIZATION, 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	99	26	61	24	131	37	17	44	22	59	313	30
No	233	60	171	66	210	60	22	56	15	41	629	61
No Response	54	14	25	10	10	3					89	9
Totals	386	100	257	100	351	100	39	100	37	100	1031	100

It seems that the larger institutions were more likely to report change in this area. Among 4-year institutions of all kinds, 33% was the average proportion indicating change in reporting line. However, non-ARL institutions offering graduate programs whose FTE enrollment was 10,000 or more, indicate a 44% "yes" response. It may be that larger institutions, with more librarians and possibly more opportunity for group action, provide an arena for a higher degree of internal change in reporting lines. One interesting comment in this area was:

TABLE 5. CHANGE IN SUPERVISORY OFFICE ABOVE LIBRARY, 1971-75.

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	12	3	14	5	29	8	1	3	2	5	57	6
No	257	67	236	92	319	91	38	97	35	95	847	82
No Response	117	30	7	3	4	1					128	12
Totals	386	100	257	100	352	100	39	100	37	100	1032	100

A change in the reporting line above the library was noted by 24% of the responding libraries; only 6% noted a change in the office or body at the end of this reporting line. This may be significant. However, without equal knowledge of other organizations, public and private, one cannot analyze this apparent imbalance of tendencies.

One comment on development in bodies above libraries was:

> As the University Administration has attempted to comply with the proliferation of federal laws and policies relating to wages, hours, racial, sexual and minority discrimination, there has been an augmentation of rules and regulations governing these matters which has significantly affected Library Administration. A good bit of our former flexibility and freedom of action has disappeared. While one may support the aims of these new regulations, one cannot ignore the fact that administrative actions in many areas are now much more difficult, and in many cases over the short run, destructive of standards of efficiency.

Employment of Consultants

This question (item 8 c. on the questionnaire), asked whether consultants were employed by the office or body to which the library's chief administrative office or body is responsible. Replies are tabulated in Table 6.

TABLE 6. EMPLOYMENT OF CONSULTANTS BY SUPERVISORY OFFICE ABOVE LIBRARY, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	159	41	118	46	152	45	18	46	2	5	431	42
No	91	24	70	27	86	25	7	18			247	24
No Response	136	35	69	27	102	30	14	36	35	95	342	34
Totals	386	100	251	100	340	100	39	100	37	100	1020	100

Some "yes" replies included comments such as, "Yes, but they are not concerned with library matters." This question was answered by 1020 libraries. Only 2 of the 37 ARL institutions gave an affirmative answer.

The results of using such consultants were revealed in some commentaries. One librarian said:

> Somewhat over five years ago,...Associates (a management consultant firm) surveyed all New Jersey state operations including the state colleges. With the implementation of their report, the full-faculty status formerly enjoyed by our librarians was removed. Since that time the state college librarians have instituted certain lawsuits in an attempt to regain that which had been lost. The same librarians were most instrumental in the successful attempt of the American Federation of Teachers to become the bargaining agent for the state college faculty and librarians. This is not to say their ability to carry out their professional responsibilities has been impaired. However, these activities have interfered, often considerably, with time available for the carrying out of their responsibilities. However, with the attainment of an agreement this year between the state authorities and the bargaining agent, the necessity for time-consuming meetings, conversations and telephone calls are apparently past, at least until it is time again to negotiate a new contract.

Change in Internal Library Reporting During the Period 1971-75

This question (item 10 on the questionnaire) asked if there had been changes in reporting lines on the library's organization chart during the period 1971-75. Replies are illustrated in Table 7.

TABLE 7. CHANGE IN REPORTING LINES OF LIBRARY ORGANIZATION, 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	99	26	61	24	131	37	17	44	22	59	313	30
No	233	60	171	66	210	60	22	56	15	41	629	61
No Response	54	14	25	10	10	3					89	9
Totals	386	100	257	100	351	100	39	100	37	100	1031	100

It seems that the larger institutions were more likely to report change in this area. Among 4-year institutions of all kinds, 33% was the average proportion indicating change in reporting line. However, non-ARL institutions offering graduate programs whose FTE enrollment was 10,000 or more, indicate a 44% "yes" response. It may be that larger institutions, with more librarians and possibly more opportunity for group action, provide an arena for a higher degree of internal change in reporting lines. One interesting comment in this area was:

> There have been no major organizational changes within the past 5 years, other than the elimination of...and 2.5 FTE library positions. In the latter case, the effect was only to shift the work load onto other library faculty and in some cases, for example in cataloging, to adjust the work in such a fashion that many nonprofessional assignments were delegated to classified staff. This was, in my estimation, a good move.

An almost desperate note was sounded by one respondent, who said: "Greater staff participation has created awesome work loads on librarians and it is felt in some areas that these additional responsibilities are having a serious impact on the ability of the librarians to effectively meet their regular professional responsibilities to the libraries." Still another inserted:

> We have established a structure (although we have only seven professionals) whereby each professional is responsible to the Director for an area such as cataloging or circulation, and all nonprofessionals are responsible through these department heads. This has increased the feeling of professionalism and also proved more efficient in terms of utilization of staff skills. Everyone seems happier with the structure, especially the Director.

A typical remark was:

> The most fundamental organizational change has been the movement toward participatory management within the library. This has resulted in all staff having to take a broader perspective of their role in the library organization. Each individual shares responsibility and authority within their unit for its successful operation. The administrative matters within units have been dispersed so that no single individual is overburdened. Decision-making is done by group process.

Change in Internal Library Committees Making Recommendations During the Period 1971-75

This question (item 11 a. on the questionnaire) asked if there had been changes in internal library committees that made recommendations on all types of library policy. Replies to this question are illustrated in Table 8. Note the significant number of ARL institutions reporting change. All of the ARL libraries answered this question.

TABLE 8. CHANGES IN LIBRARY INTERNAL POLICY-RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES, 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUP A & B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
No change	282	44	165	48	7	18	15	40	462	45
Change	141	22	95	28	20	51	22	60	258	25
No Response	220	34	82	24	12	31			302	30
Totals	643	100	342	100	39	100	37	100	1022	100

Change in Internal Library Committees Making Decisions During the Period 1971-75

This question (item 12 a. on the questionnaire) asked if there had been changes during the past 5 years in library committees that make decisions (as opposed to recommendations) on all types of library policy. The replies are illustrated in Table 9.

TABLE 9. CHANGE IN LIBRARY INTERNAL POLICY-MAKING COMMITTEES, 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUPS A & B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
No Change	137	21	111	32	6	15	28	76	276	27
Change	23	4	34	10	14	36	9	24	66	6
No Response	483	75	201	58	19	49			684	67
Totals	643	100	346	100	39	100	37	100	1026	100

Of the 2- and 4-year institutions without graduate programs, 4% cited a change in the policy-making committees. However, in the previous question, note that this group cited 22% change in policy-recommending committees. Only 34, or 10% of the 346 type C libraries reported a change in policy-making committees. However, 95, or 28% of this group noted a change in policy-recommending committees. Of 37 ARL libraries, 9 or 24% noted a change in policy-making committees. This is in contrast to 22 out of 37 ARL libraries, or 60% citing a change in policy-recommending committees. Of 1026 libraries answering the question on policy-making committees, 67% gave no response. However, 30% of 1022 libraries answering the question on policy-recommending committees fell into the "no response" category.

Speculation can be raised on cause and effect here. It was originally hypothesized that there would be significant change in policy-making committees. Judging from these totals, further investigation is needed here. Some interesting comments follow:

> There is basically no shared decision-making power vested in anyone save the Director. The faculty, however, does make decisions by vote on faculty matters. There is a distinction between administrative matters and faculty matters. Ordinarily, the distinction is clear.

> There is one clear area in which the faculty does make decisions. Its committee on salaries, tenure and promotions decides for or against promotions and tenure, and makes judgment relative to merit increases. But this committee is only one agent in the entire process. It receives the decisions of the 3 Assistant Directors and in turn passes their decisions on to the Director. The Director then makes a decision. Where there is disparity, the 3 levels are supposed to come to an agreement before passing the matter on to the university-wide committee. This latter committee then hands its determinations on to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. This faculty process is the same for all colleges on

campus, basically. These are true decisions but they relate to faculty matters and not to administrative matters in the library. This situation has been in effect for more than 5 years.

All its (the committee's) decisions must be confirmed by Library or University Administration. So far, in 3 years, there have been no serious conflicts or vetoes.

Finally, responsibility for policy rests with the Director; however, he would be a poor leader if he did not give close attention to recommendations of the collegial body.

In response to "List library committees that make decisions (as opposed to recommendations) on all types of library policy," on director wrote: "There are none in theory, but in reality, I frequently have no choice but to accept decisions although the responsibility remains mine. But this is to say no more than I am a manager like any other."

Portion of Decisions Directly Affecting Library Policy Made by Individuals and Groups Outside the Library in Summer 1971

Answers to question 15 e. are highlighted in Table 10. With a few exceptions, the striking fact that comes to mind from studying this table is the similarity, across the board, of all types of institutions. Regrettably, as the questionnaire passed through more than one generation of "authors," the significance of "some" and "few" was not clarified.

TABLE 10. PORTION OF LIBRARY POLICY DECISIONS MADE BY OUTSIDE INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS, SUMMER 1971

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
None	28	7	37	14	50	15	8	21	5	14	120	12
Some	78	20	58	23	73	21	8	20	5	14	214	21
Few	155	40	105	41	146	43	16	41	17	45	423	41
No Response	125	32	57	22	72	21	7	18	10	27	264	26
Totals	386	100	257	100	341	100	39	100	37	100	1021	100

Portion of Decisions Directly Affecting Library Policy Made by Individuals and Groups Outside the Library in Summer 1976

This is based on question 15 d. asking "Approximately what portion of all library policy decisions are made by persons or groups outside the library in summer 1976?" These replies are illustrated in Table 11. They should be studied in conjunction with those illustrating external decision-making influence in 1971.

TABLE 11. PORTION OF LIBRARY POLICY DECISIONS MADE BY OUTSIDE INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
None	23	6	31	12	44	13	5	13	6	16	104	10
Some	87	22	55	21	72	21	10	26	6	16	220	22
Few	176	46	125	49	164	48	17	44	18	49	483	47
No Response	100	26	46	18	61	18	7	18	7	19	214	21
Totals	386	100	257	100	341	100	39	100	37	100	1021	100

Of 1021 libraries providing data in this area, 104 or 10% answered, "none." This might indicate a small drop in the number of libraries reporting no outside decision-making force. These tables indicate, more than anything else, a need for clarification of terminology. Some examples of institutional policy's impact on the library follow:

> Implementation of revised personnel policy for all campus nonprofessional personnel, including student employees, assigns direct authority for these people to the College Business Manager. This makes it virtually impossible for librarians to maintain schedules and to plan a day ahead. Changing maintenance policy, which removes supervision of the library maintenance personnel from the College Librarian and places this supervision with the College Business Manager, has resulted in a poorly kept library building and, in many cases, in professional librarians doing maintenance chores. The lack of continued Library representation on long-range planning groups and the consistent refusal of the College President to accept Library input in academic and administrative matters are resulting in serious morale and service problems.

> The overriding requirements of the Affirmative Action Program is making it mandatory that we train and assign one staff professional to coordinate the personnel responsibilities and to maintain the paperwork. This siphons one more of the library faculty into an administrative position. Although this is necessary, it further reduces the "live" library faculty.

> There are some developments which have affected the ability of our library faculty to carry out their professional responsiblities. We have become involved in a number of contractual agreements with EPA, USDA, NASA and so forth, which have diluted the emphasis on reference service. With these added work loads invariably comes commitment, but seldom staff. We have, as a result, been much more involved in providing reference services through commercial data bases. This has involved, of course, the acquisition of expensive equipment and training programs for on-line reference service.

> As class sizes increase, the teaching professor often relies more heavily on library service. Thus, in a period of fiscal stringency, library use increases both in number and intensity, while staff size remains stable or even decreases. Demand for longer hours and greater

service by all members of the college community must be coped with under the most difficult circumstances. Clerical staff (or support staff) are equally overwhelmed with work in a period of personnel limitations.

At a time when libraries should be turning in ever-increasing numbers to computer-assisted housekeeping, the hardware costs have skyrocketed. Thus, many large libraries are as manually operated as the small branch satellites of yesteryear.

Organization of Librarians as a Faculty or in a Similar Structure in Summer 1976

Answers to this question (item 13 on the questionnaire) are illustrated in Table 12.

TABLE 12. ORGANIZATION OF LIBRARIANS IN A FACULTY OR SIMILAR STRUCTURE, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	196	51	95	37	183	54	29	74	22	59	496	49
No	169	44	144	56	144	43	8	21	15	41	472	46
No Response	21	5	18	7	11	3	2	5			50	5
Totals	386	100	257	100	338	100	39	100	37	100	1018	100

Scrutiny of this table seems to indicate that librarians in the weakest position are those in 4-year, nongraduate degree institutions. This group reports only 37% organization. Librarians are strongest, with an indicated 74% organization factor, in institutions offering graduate programs, with FTE enrollment of 10,000 or more, whose libraries are not ARL members. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know how many are "faculty" and how many are "similar." This question produced a variety of comments:

> Librarians are organized as a faculty holding full faculty rank and status.
>
> The Library has always been considered a department of the college and the librarians have had complete faculty status granted (including 9-month contracts) for over 50 years.
>
> Librarians are members of the general faculty; upon attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with tenure, they are members of the Faculty of Arts and Science.
>
> We are organized as a collegial body, which elects our chairmen, steering committees, etc.

The new personnel program created a so-called Department of Library Administration, however it is not a bona fide department as are all the teaching departments. The Director of Libraries does report to the Provost and is a member of the executive council.

Rank is assigned according to one's position. The Director of Libraries holds the rank of Professor. The Associate Directors and Head Librarians of the branch campuses are Associate Professors. The Department Heads are Assistant Professors and all others are Instructors. Promotion is only by advancement to a position holding a higher rank or by receiving a doctorate. The administrators (5) are not eligible for continuing contracts. All those with rank above Instructor are eligible for continuing contract. This has been interpreted by the University as tenure after some pressure from the librarians for an interpretation. Instructors receive annual contracts and these can be renewed indefinitely.

Such an arrangement leaves a lot to be desired, especially if you are a young librarian who sees little chance for advancement. Perhaps it does not have an impact on their ability to carry out their professional responsibilities, but it must affect their initiative and motivation.

The Library system is not operated like an academic department since there are a series of administrative operations which are not suitable to collegial discussion. The hope is that we have as much participation in the management of the Library by the staff as is possible and acceptable to the staff.

Exclusion of Any Librarians from Faculty Organization or Similar Structure in Summer 1976

The question (item 13 c. on the questionnaire) sought to identify any librarians excluded from the structure. Marginal notes showed some misunderstanding as to what constituted a "librarian" in this case. Those specifically mentioned as being excluded were CETA librarians, part-time staff and those without an MLS. Totals are illustrated in Table 13.

TABLE 13. EXCLUSION OF ANY LIBRARIANS FROM FACULTY OR SIMILAR STRUCTURE, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUPS A & B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
None	201	31	140	40	8	21	18	49	359	35
Exclusions	24	4	53	15	20	51	2	5	79	8
No Response	418	65	159	45	11	28	17	46	594	57
Totals	643	100	352	100	39	100	37	100	1032	100

Organization of Librarians as a Faculty or Similar Structure Cited as a Change During the Period 1971-75

Item 13 b. sought to learn if the faculty organization was created during the 5 years considered in this study. Replies are highlighted in Table 14.

TABLE 14. ORGANIZATION OF LIBRARIANS INTO A FACULTY OR SIMILAR STRUCTURE OCCURRING DURING 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	35	9	32	12	67	19	7	18	13	35	147	14
No	118	31	58	23	140	40	21	54	11	30	327	32
No Response	233	60	167	65	142	41	11	28	13	35	555	54
Totals	386	100	257	100	349	100	39	100	37	100	1029	100

It is important to remember that 496 libraries reported such an organization (see Table 12). In Table 14, it is apparent that 147 of these libraries indicate this organization took place since 1971--almost 30%. An analysis of faculty or faculty-like structure as an element of change is provided in Table 15.

TABLE 15. ANALYSIS OF FACULTY OR SIMILAR STRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONS AS ELEMENT OF CHANGE

FACULTY ORGANIZATION	GROUP A	GROUP B	GROUP C	GROUP X	GROUP D	TOTALS
Existing in summer 1976	196	95	183	29	22	496
Occurred since 1971	35	32	67	7	13	147
Cited as element of change	18%	34%	37%	24%	59%	30%

Unionization

This question (item 16 on the questionnaire) asked: "Is the library staff unionized?" Answers are tabulated in Table 16.

TABLE 16. UNIONIZATION OF LIBRARY STAFF, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	92	24	18	7	53	15	8	21	12	32	175	17
No	282	73	239	93	289	84	27	69	25	68	835	82
No Response	12	3			3	1	4	10			15	1
Totals	386	100	257	100	345	100	39	100	37	100	1025	100

Examination of totals revealed the following array of unionization from the lowest to the highest percentage:

lowest Group B: 4-year institutions without graduate programs

Group C: 4-year institutions, not ARL members, offering graduate programs

Group A: 2-year institutions

Group X: 4-year institutions...or more

highest Group D: ARL institutions

This question evoked more "yes" and "no" replies than any other. Only 15 out of 1025 libraries fell into the "no response" category. Some typical comments pertaining to problems are reproduced here:

> The union contract which covers the library staff is heavily directed toward faculty rights and responsibilities. The librarians' rights are derivative and responsibilities (load, hours, etc.) to date have not been detailed. Confusion in interpretation may often result.

> Unionization has thrust upon the library faculty responsibility for making decisions concerning promotion and peer evaluation. At first, the authorization was welcomed but the responsibility is now considered a chore to be performed (when it is performed) with as little irritation as possible. Hence, evaluations are, "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours"; in other words, generally ineffectual.

> Since the Director of Libraries is not involved with the faculty in these personnel recommendations, the recommendations have little or no effect on library operation except that the administrator's position is considerably weakened by not having a specified vote in managing personnel.

> Librarians are encouraged (and expected) to make recommendations regarding their professional duties. They plan work schedules, have committees regarding professional affairs, facilities, budget, tenure, etc. They are allowed to attend faculty union meetings (campus-wide as well as departmental-wide) and are considered for promotions, tenure and sabbaticals, along with the teaching faculty. Following are excerpts relating to librarians from a union contract.

> <u>Libraries</u>
>
> Subject to the provisions hereof, all members of the professional library staff shall enjoy full faculty status with all the rights, privileges and responsibilities pertaining thereto. For administrative purposes, the professional librarians shall constitute a department.

2. Librarians in the performance of their duties as such shall be scheduled for no more than 35 hours per week, and librarians also shall be expected, as are other faculty members, to assume committee assignments and other campus responsibilities.

3. Librarians who were granted academic faculty rank shall accrue credits toward sabbatical leave only from the date the academic faculty rank was granted.

4. A librarian's schedule shall be based on library needs as determined by the President or his/her designee in consultation with members of the library faculty.

5. (Institution) shall conduct an election among all of the members of the library faculty to designate a chairperson who shall act in a representational role for the department. The chairperson shall reflect the view of the members of the library faculty in their consultations with the President or his/her designee on matters of appointments or faculty, renewal and nonrenewal of faculty, faculty development and evaluation, promotion, tenure, librarian's schedule.

   Until the present, we have elected the Head Librarian whose title was changed to coordinator. We have recently been told that with the advent of collective bargaining, coordinators will be appointed and become part of the administration. The decision on this will be forthcoming from the State Collective Bargaining Board.

Unionization Cited as a Change During the Period 1971-75

This question (item 16 c. on the questionnaire) asked if unionization occurred during the past 5 years (preceding the questionnaire's administration, in summer 1976). Totals are displayed in Table 17.

TABLE 17. CHANGE TO UNIONIZATION OCCURRING DURING 1971-75

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	62	16	12	5	49	14	6	15	12	32	135	13
No	32	8	6	2	39	11	5	13	25	68	102	10
No Response	292	76	239	93	261	75	28	72			792	77
Totals	386	100	257	100	349	100	39	100	37	100	1029	100

Replies are most meaningful when compared to those for the basic question on unionization. Findings are summarized below:

Group A: 92 libraries unionized; 62 within the past 5 years

Group B: 18 libraries unionized; 12 within the past 5 years

Group C: 53 libraries unionized; 49 within the past 5 years

Group D: 12 libraries unionized; all within the past 5 years

Although the numbers are small, the trend is marked. One view of this is revealed in the following comment:

> It is too early, here, to predict the impact of unionization on library operations. With respect to union participation at the board level, in such matters as wages and benefits the new influence will probably be useful, perhaps even necessary, to obtain needed relief. However, in light of this University's own organization, one in which librarians must leave the library and join a collegiate organization to obtain faculty status, unionization will be less effective. Librarians cannot speak as a force at the board level nor on the local campus. Under such conditions, it is feared that union activity will be ineffective and divisive.

Tenure, Summer 1976

Item 18 on the questionnaire asked, "Do your librarians have tenure?" Answers to this are illustrated in Table 18.

TABLE 18. LIBRARIANS HAVING TENURE, SUMMER 1976

RESPONSE	GROUP A	%	GROUP B	%	GROUP C	%	GROUP X	%	GROUP D	%	TOTALS	%
Yes	222	57	113	44	191	60	31	79	26	70	552	55
No	150	39	142	55	123	39	6	15	11	30	426	43
No Response	14	4	2	1	4	1	2	5			20	2
Totals	386	100	257	100	318	100	39	100	37	100	998	100

Libraries in Institutions with FTE of 10,000 or More

Group X, indicated in the tables, illustrates totals for those group C libraries whose reported FTE is 10,000 or more. With available data, the differences in these non-ARL graduate degree-granting institutions are not explained and undoubtedly bear further study.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summarizing statements from several respondents are appropriate at this point:

> Former Dean was a strong library supporter; we hope the new Provost will be, too. In my observation, the attitude of the chief academic officer toward the library is far more significant in determining his real (as opposed to paper) status, power and effectiveness than his place on any organization chart.

The Chief Librarian has never reported directly to the Provost, but instead to a dean of one of the 3 divisions of the college. A reorganization of the college was proposed, providing for a new Dean for Academic Resources, again under the Provost, to whom the Library, Center for Instructional Development (Audio Visual, TV, etc.), Computer Center, and Testing Service would report. This program was opposed by me and my staff on the grounds that there was no real need for such a full-time dean to supervise only four such diverse units and that the Library was too important to be placed again on a level once removed from the Provost. The result was that a reorganization proposal was adopted by the College's Academic Senate and later approved...that the Library would be directly under the Provost. However, this change has so far not been put into effect.

Some months ago the University Library was bumped down a notch in our fine administrative hierarchy by assignment, for all problems and reporting purposes, from the Provost to the Dean of the Graduate School. Now, less than a year later, the Planning Staff group makes further recommendation regarding the place of the Library and its role in its report to the commission on the future of this University.

Inevitably, the administration of an academic library has become more cumbersome. This is not so much due to organizational changes as to changes within the organization. The administrative personnel in a university tend to revolve more rapidly, and there is a debilitating loss of continuity. Also, university administrations, operating in a politicized arena, are not always as neatly and efficiently responsive vis-a-vis library relations as perhaps they once were.

If you have read this questionnaire thus far, you would think no change had occurred and this is true as far as the formal organizational structure is concerned. But since you are an investigator of these matters, you know that the formal structure is not necessarily governing. What is happening to this institution is a gradual paralysis of the will to decide and to manage. The decision-maker is increasingly hemmed in by staff attitudes, societal goals, and institutional inertia which inhibit decisions. The preservation of concord and amity are preferred to functional efficiency. Of course, one needs unity of response and identification with organizational goals as well as willing cooperation but what I fear is happening is that the balance has been upset. Administrators at every level are fleeing responsibility. Their will to decide is weakening. Pseudo-professional concerns are trumpeted. Democracy is preached but anarchy rules. Librarians for the most part are becoming increasingly narcissistic. They are failing to embrace new perspectives and new technologies. I think they will resist real functional change in the mission of the library. Substitutes for the library will be found and the library will wither. So the fault is in ourselves, in our society and in our profession. I think we have experienced a loss of verve which we must recover if we are to survive. We need to be less personal, less selfish, and more dedicated to organizational goals.

In conclusion, the questionnaire developed by the Committee on Comparative Library Organization has produced an interesting body of information. Evaluation of replies provides an assessment of "where we are." This is important as a first step in thoughtful planning of "where we go from here." The overall significant, quantitative changes predicted were not evident.

Original goals of the committee included an analysis of the role of the library director as he or she coped with change. The goal was only indirectly met. Percentage profiles of some change in the library environment have been made available through this study. Unfortunately, the study has not accurately determined collective or individual response of library directors to that change. Cause/effect relationships cannot be adequately assigned with results in hand. The study is perhaps most valuable when considered as a foundation for further research.

The value of careful phrasing and use of terminology is evident. Especially regrettable flaws were use of "faculty or faculty-like," as a descriptor and assignment of hierarchical values to the terms "some" and "few." Problems like these may be typical in a form designed and tested by successive groups of volunteers over a period of time. The study points up the worth of continuous, direct involvement of personnel in a task like this. It is, of course, crucial to understand societal factors surrounding any tabulated change. The strength of personal interviews might compensate for the uncertainty that accompanies a mailed form. The importance of a reliable, ongoing mechanism for gathering and interpreting data on the size and strength of the factors covered in the study is apparent.

Respondents often do not view the long-sought faculty status as a panacea. In many institutions professional librarians, attempting to fit themselves into a faculty model, are experiencing difficulties. They convinced college and university administration that original cataloging and reference work were equal to the work of classroom teachers in complexity and in contribution to education. Now, in some instances, that cataloging and reference work, used as justification for faculty status, appears to be shortchanged. Time formerly devoted to librarianship is now consumed by committee work and other faculty-related activities. The Committee on Comparative Library Organization came to the conclusion that an in-depth study of duties, rights, responsibilities and governance of college and university libraries might more properly be investigated under the aegis of the Association of College and Research Libraries.

With some individual exceptions, 4-year institutions not offering graduate programs seemed most conservative. As measured by this study, the 39 ARL libraries reported being most affected by changes.

Participatory management, although not discussed in the questionnaire, was mentioned time and again in open-ended replies. Some decisions made by committees are not universally viewed as an improvement on, or even different from, the old unilateral, director-made decisions. There is an implication for continuing education. Librarians who are members of self-governing committees should upgrade their management and communication skills if the emerging organizational formats are to be productive. Receipt of an MLS does not make anyone a manager, a personnel expert or an authority on interpersonal relations. Of all changes revealed by the data collected, perhaps most striking is the recency of faculty organization and unionization. It will be enlightening to observe the rate and direction of these

trends during the period 1976-80. It might be desirable to observe academic libraries in general to learn if service to patrons is measurably different in situations where professional staff enjoy the currently more desirable governance situations. Plans for the proposed 1976-80 investigation should begin with decisions on modification of format and administration of the questionnaire. However, improvement and strengthening of the instrument, if overextended, could neutralize the comparative value of totals gathered. Further study might analyze variables such as age of institutions and public vs. private support of colleges or universities.

Anyone working with the questionnaires is struck by the sincerity and professional generosity of respondents. One of those reading the mass of returns suggested the study be called, "Who's in Charge?" Another suggested the title, "The Grass Isn't Always Greener on the Other Side of the Fence." One questionnaire was returned with nothing written on the form itself. It was stapled to a letter whose humor and tone suggests a fitting close for a report on "factors affecting library administration in academic libraries." The letter begins:

> Dear Sir:
>
> Please forgive the rambling format of the answer to questions about the internal and external workings of this library. Only in a rambling format can some sense of the extreme disorganization of this institution be expressed. Indeed, it is impossible for anyone at this institution to answer questions such as the form posits. That would imply that someone here has a general sense of how things work, that there is some well-thought-out organization chart and definite lines of command. Such is not the case. Furthermore, it never has been. Which brings me to an important point regarding all questions which ask about changes within the last 5 years. Simply put, there have been no real changes in the lines of command in the last 5 years, for one of the unspoken rules here is to change as little as possible, and then, only very slowly and very cautiously. However, I will attempt to answer your questions.

The author of the letter goes on to describe an administrative maze involving blood relatives and in-laws of the president and chairman of the board. Somewhere in this maze is an officer, of whom the librarian says: "It is to this person I am technically to report. However, I never see her except for rare occasions. In actuality, I am in the grip of the Business Manager, who pays all the bills and makes all the petty decisions of the college. It is with this man that I have most of the contact outside the Library." He continues by noting:

> A group of professors, as well as the Dean for Instruction, make recommendations (very seldom) and make decisions (any purchase over $40 must be approved by this body). No one ever comes to the Library Committee meetings; maybe 2 or 4 show up from a total of 12....The only time the trustees think about the Library is at the beginning of the fiscal year when they apparently say, "Oh, let's give the Library the same amount it had last year." Or in January of the next year when they say, "Finances are tight--let's cut the Library budget." Outside of this, there is virtually no contact with anyone outside the Library.

No one knows what we do here, no one cares to find out. We are an oasis of sanity and organization in an insane atmosphere.

Our library staff is not unionized, our librarians do not have tenure, and nothing has been changed in the past 5 years.

Needless to say, I depend on the "strictest confidence" mentioned in your letter. For if anyone here saw this, I would be fired.

Hope this answers your questions.

Sincerely,

REFERENCES

1. This, and many other comments of respondents, are not attributed because of promised confidentiality.

2. Doman, Glenn. How to Teach Your Baby to Read: The Gentle Revolution. New York, Random House, 1964, p. vii.

3. American Library Association. ALA Handbook of Organization 1976-1977. Chicago, ALA, 1976, p. 39.

4. Ibid, p. 40.

5. Ibid, p. 41.

6. McAnally, Arthur M., and Downs, Robert B. "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries," College & Research Libraries 34:103, March 1973.

7. Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. Organization and Staffing of the Libraries of Columbia University: A Case Study. Westport, Conn., Redgrave Information Resources, 1973, p. 45.

8. Association of Research Libraries. ARL Statistics 1975-1976. Washington, DC, Association of Research Libraries, 1976, p. 5.

APPENDIX I. QUESTIONNAIRE

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION DIVISION
LIBRARY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SECTION
COMMITTEE ON COMPARATIVE LIBRARY ORGANIZATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIES
(Attach an additional sheet for replies, if necessary)

1. Name of institution:

2. Is your institution a 4-year with graduate programs ____
   4-year without graduate programs ____
   2-year institution ____

3. Age of institution: More than 25 years ____
   10 to 25 years ____
   5 to 10 years ____
   Less than 5 years ____

4. Size of your student population, FTE (USOE definition), for fall semester 1974:

I. Internal

5. Attach a Campus Organization Chart showing official reporting line from Library Director to Chief Administrative Officer. Identify work title and positions along the line.

6. Has this reporting line(path) changed within the past five years?
   Yes____ No____

   a. If yes, how?

   b. If yes, who or what was responsible for the change?

7. What is the final supervisory body or person to whom your Chief Administrative Office is responsible?

8. Has this body or person changed within the past 5 years? Yes____ No____

   a. If yes, what change has occurred?

   b. If yes, who or what was responsible for the change?

c. Does this body or person employ consultants? Yes____ No____

9. Attach an Organization Chart for your library.

10. Have the reporting lines changed within the past 5 years? Yes____ No____

a. If yes, how?

b. If yes, what prompted the change(s)?

c. If available, please enclose an Organization Chart in use 5 years ago.

11. List the library committees, if any, that make recommendations on all types of library policy.

Committee Name	General Function	Status(Standing/Ad hoc)

a. What changes does this represent over the past 5 years?

12. List the library committees that make decisions on all types of library policy.

Committee Name	General Function	Status(Standing/Ad hoc)

a. What changes does this represent over the past 5 years?

13. Are your librarians organized as a library faculty or structured in a similar manner? Yes____ No____

a. If so, please briefly describe.

b. Has this organization occurred within the past 5 years? Yes____ No____

c. Which librarians, if any, are excluded from the library faculty?

14. What kinds of decisions relating to library policy are made by the body described in #13?

II. External

15. Who, outside the library, makes decisions affecting library policy?

    a. What changes does this represent over the past 5 years?

    b. What kinds of decisions are made by each person or group?

    c. What changes have occurred in the past 5 years in the kinds of decisions being made?

    d. Approximately what portion of all library policy decisions are made by such persons or groups? None____ Some____ Few____

    e. Would you please answer the same question, 'd', for 5 years ago. None____ Some____ Few____ Please describe any significant changes.

16. Is your library staff unionized? Yes____ No____

    a. If yes, which categories of staff (administration, nonadministrative librarians, nonlibrarian staff, and students) belong to the union(s)?

    b. What unions are represented?

    c. Has unionization occurred in the past 5 years? Yes____ No____

17. Please comment on any other organizational changes within the past 5 years, within the library or the parent institution, which are having an impact on the ability of librarians to carry out their professional responsibilities.

18. Do your librarians have tenure? Yes____ No____

APPENDIX II. CODING SHEET

ITEM #	# ON QUESTIONNAIRE	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSE
1		Sequential number	_ _ _ _ _
2		Date	_ _/_ _/76
3	1	Name of Institution	
4	2	Institution Type	1. 4-year/grad 2. 4-year/no grad 3. 2-year 4. no response
5	3	Institution Age	1. 25 plus 2. 10-25 3. 5-10 4. less than 5 5. no response
6	4	FTE	
7	6	Change in reporting line above library, past 5 yrs.	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
8	8	Change in supervisory bodies above library, past 5 yrs.	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
9	8c.	Employment of consultants	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
10	10	Change in library reporting line, past 5 years	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
11	11a.	Change in policy/recommending lbry committees, past 5 yrs.	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
12	12a.	Change in policy/decision lbry committees, past 5 yrs.	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
13	13	Faculty or faculty-like library organization	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
14	13b.	Change in faculty organization, past 5 years	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
15	13c.	Any librarians excluded from faculty organization	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
16	15d.	Portion of lbry policy dec. made by extra-lbry groups or indivs.	1. none 2. some 3. few 4. no response 5. unable to classify
17	15e.	Portion of library policy dec. by extra-lbry groups or indivs. made 5 years ago	1. none 2. some 3. few 4. no response 5. unable to classify
18	16	Library staff unionized	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
19	16c.	Unionization--past 5 years	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify
20	18	Librarians have tenure	1. yes 2. no 3. no response 4. unable to classify